UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,038	10/10/2001	Takeshi Ono	50195-270	5054

7590 03/22/2007

McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER	
PIERRE, MYRIAM	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/973,038	ONO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Myriam Pierre	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/22/07*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *10-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *10-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Remarks, filed 12/22/2006.

2. Claims 10-17 are pending.

distinction

Response to Argument

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikio Sasaki (JP 11-351901 Translated text attached) in view of Kazuga Sako (5,852,804).

As to claim 10, Sasaki teaches a speech recognition updatable system applied to a vehicle, comprising:

a speech collecting device collecting a set of words spoken by a driver (Detailed Description, page 2 paragraph 10, Abstract, speech key word of user, conditions inside the vehicle);

a storing section (data storage) storing preliminarily a set of recognition words (key words) used for speech recognition and a set of operation patterns (index or category), associated

with the recognition words (page 2 paragraphs 11 lines 1-5 and 15; and page 6 paragraph 46; page 3 paragraph 19); and

a searching section (setting out means) searching a recognition word, which has the highest matching degree with a spoken word (demand presumption means) collected by the speech collecting device (page 2 paragraph 10) from the set of recognition words (page 2 paragraph 12, 15, page 3 paragraph 18 and 24)

a mode setting section setting (operation gestalt) a registration mode for registering a spoken word collected by the speech collecting device (operation gestalt , utterances...memorizes a dialog database, (thus recognition words are inherent in memorizing dialog) page 5 paragraph 37-38, page 3 paragraph 10, paragraph 21; page 2 paragraph 11; page 10 paragraph 76 and paragraph 77);

a communication unit communicates with a base station (page 2 paragraph 9 lines 3-5);

an input device inputting various information for communicating with the base station (internet) via the communication unit (wireless) (page 2 paragraphs 7-9);

an operation setting (activity setting) section setting an operation pattern for a recognition word collected by the speech collecting device under the registration mode, based on information obtained in communication with the base station (page 1 paragraph 9, 11 and page 3 paragraph 21);

a registration section (control unit for setting up the activity of the device, page 2 paragraph 11-12; and paragraph 76-77) registering the recognition word and the operation pattern set by the operation setting section (page 2 paragraph 12 and page 3 paragraph 18);

a control section controlling the vehicle device, based on an operation pattern associated with to a recognition word searched by the searching section (page 2 paragraph 9); and

wherein the operation setting section serves to recognize word stored preliminarily in the storing section with a recognition word collected by the speech collecting device under the registration mode as to register an operation pattern associated with the recognition word, (page 1 paragraph 11-12, 15 and page 3 paragraphs 20-25, 29); and

wherein the operation pattern is one of an operation pattern stored preliminarily in the storing section and an operation pattern set by the driver (paragraph 16).

Sasaki does not explicitly teach a newly registered recognition word collected by the speech collecting device and new operational patterns and replace a recognition word.

However, Sako does teach a newly registered recognition word collected by the speech collecting device and new operational patterns (col. 1 line 64- col. 2 line 2) and replace a recognition word (delete registration pattern and confirming registration pattern) (Abstract, col. 2 lines 37-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the control device of Sasaki into the in-vehicle speech recognition of Sako, because Sako teaches that this would provide newly registered recognition word, and therefore, the new registration pattern can be used to recognize the new speech command that was not recognized before that registration, col. 2 lines 37-45.

As to claim 12, which depends on claim 10, Sasaki teaches wherein

the input device includes a keyboard (page 2 paragraph 9 lines 3-5 and paragraph 10) and

wherein the operation setting section serves to allocate an operational pattern to a recognition word selected from information inputted by the keyboard under the registration mode (page 1 paragraph 10 lines 1-6, 12 and 16; and page 3 paragraph 24);

Sasaki does not explicitly teach allocate newly an operational pattern to a new recognition word.

However, Sako does teach allocate newly an operational pattern to a new recognition word (Abstract, col. 1 line 64- col. 2 line 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the control device of Sasaki into the in-vehicle speech recognition of Sako, because Sako teaches that this would provide newly registered recognition, and therefore, the new registration pattern can be used to recognize the new speech command that as not recognized before that registration, col. 2 lines 37-45.

As to claim 13, which depends on claim 10, Sasaki teaches wherein

the operational setting section is able to access a word database of the base station via the communication unit for thereby setting an operational pattern to a recognition word in the word database (page 2 paragraphs 9 and 12 ; and page 3 paragraph 18).

Sasaki does not explicitly teach setting newly an operational pattern to a new recognition word in the word database.

However, Sako does teach setting newly an operational pattern to a new recognition word in the word database (Abstract, col. 1 line 64- col. 2 line 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the control device of Sasaki into the in-vehicle speech recognition of Sako, because Sako teaches that this would provide newly registered recognition, and therefore, the new registration pattern can be used to recognize the new speech command that as not recognized before that registration, col. 2 lines 37-45.

As to claim 14, which depends on claim 10, Sasaki teaches the operation setting section is able to set an icon (gestalt) to a recognition word registered under the registration mode (page 7 paragraph 55 lines 1-8; and page 10 paragraph 76).

Sasaki does not explicitly teach a new recognition word registered.

However, Sako does teach a new recognition word registered (Abstract, col. 2 lines 49-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the control device of Sasaki into the in-vehicle speech recognition of Sako, because Sako teaches that this would provide newly registered recognition, and therefore, the new registration pattern can be used to recognize the new speech command that as not recognized before that registration, col. 2 lines 37-45.

As to claim 15, which depends on claim 10, Sasaki teaches the control section allows a display device to display at least one of a set registration word registered by the operation setting section under the registration mode and an icon associated with the new recognition word (page 10 paragraph 76, page 3 paragraph 18, 20-23, and page 7 paragraph 52).

Sasaki does not explicitly teach new registration word registered by the operation.

However, Sako does teach new registration word registered by the operation (Abstract, col. 1 line 64- col. 2 line 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the control device of Sasaki into the in-vehicle speech recognition of Sako, because Sako teaches that this would provide newly registered recognition, and therefore, the new registration pattern can be used to recognize the new speech command that as not recognized before that registration, col. 2 lines 37-45.

Claim 16 is directed toward a system applied to a vehicle to implement the system in claim 1, and is similar in scope and content of claim 1, therefore, claim 16 is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is directed toward a method to implement the system in claim 1, and is similar in scope and content of claim 1, therefore, claim 16 is rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon but considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is listed on the attached PTO-892.

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myriam Pierre whose telephone number is 571-272-7611. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 5:30 a.m. - 2:00p.m.

5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

6. Information as to the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Myriam Pierre
AU 2626
03/12/07

TALIVALDIS IVARS SMITS
PRIMARY EXAMINER